



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/003,122 | 11/14/2001 | Mike Dennis | OAE 306 | 5951 |

23855 7590 05/06/2003

ROBERT D. VARITZ, P.C.
2007 S.E. GRANT STREET
PORTLAND, OR 97214

EXAMINER

KAVANAUGH, JOHN T

| | |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

3728

DATE MAILED: 05/06/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

Washington, D.C. 20231

| | | | |
|---------------------------------|-------------|---|---------------------|
| APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. |
|---------------------------------|-------------|---|---------------------|

| |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

| | |
|----------|-------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER |
|----------|-------|


11

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

The reply filed on Feb. 18, 2003 is not fully responsive to the prior Office Action because: the reply doesn't satisfies the requirements of 37 CFR 1.111 such as applicant hasn't "specifically point out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references". Applicant hasn't provided no comment specific or general on how the claims now define of the prior art rejection. Applicant needs to be specific. Applicant has provided a general statement of how "Some of the material referred to in this additional commercial literature are indeed slow-return materials, but not ones which perform with the acceleration-rate-sensitive called for in Applicants' claims, and present in Applicants' invention". However, this general statement is not specific on how the claims define over the prior art. Specific comments need to be provided with regard to the prior art rejection and the newly cited prior art. Applicant should also specifically point out the support for any amendments made to the disclosure. See MPEP 2163.06" MPEP 714.02. Regarding the Obvious type Double Patenting rejection, there is no official paper in these applications reflecting that they are abandoned, other than applicant's statement in this application that they are abandoned. With regard to documents A and B, it is still suggested applicant delete the reference to these documents in the specification. Moreover, if the application is allowed these documents will not be attached to the patent and therefore this information would be moot. If applicant wants these documents part of the specification then he should provide a proper amendment to the specification and demonstrate how this material is not new matter. The documents can be kept in the file and applicant could list them on a PTO-1449. Applicant states that these documents were present in the other applications, however these applications were filed after this application. Since the above-mentioned reply appears to be *bona fide*, applicant is given **ONE (1) MONTH or THIRTY (30) DAYS** from the mailing date of this notice, whichever is longer, within which to supply the omission or correction in order to avoid abandonment. EXTENSIONS OF THIS TIME PERIOD MAY BE GRANTED UNDER 37 CFR 1.136(a).


Ted Kavanaugh
Primary Examiner
Art Unit: 3728

BEST AVAILABLE COPY